



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,405	01/31/2002	Yuki Aoyama	16869N-041900US	3749

20350 7590 07/05/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,405

Applicant(s)

AOYAMA ET AL

Examiner

James H. Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 9 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 6-8, 10 and 12-15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

William F. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

6/30/2005

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to receipt of amendment on **04/04/2005** in response to a First action sent **12/22/2004** on an original application filed **01/31/2002**.
2. Claims 1-15 are pending.
3. Claims 1-2, 5-6, and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,813,009. Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. j 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al.
4. Claims 4 and 8 were not examined due to improper multiple dependency. The multiple dependencies have been removed. Claims 4 and 8 will now be examined on the merits.
5. Claims 12-15 are new claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10, and 12-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1, 5, 9, and 11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (hereinafter Johnson, U.S. Patent No. 5,813,009).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 5, 9, and 11), Johnson teaches a computer based records management system (a *document management means*) comprising an information filter (*linkage*) for assuring that record data units offered to the system for storage (an *accumulation means*) are complete and not redundant. Record data units accepted for the system entry are acknowledged and preferably tagged to enable tracking and forwarded for unit verification and certification. Once a unit is found to be compliant with preset criteria, the unit is stored in permanent storage (*document is accumulated*) along with a disposal schedule determined for that unit (see Abstract).

Johnson also teaches that *version management* is used to control/reduce multiple iterations of electronic data which may be resident within an organization, across applicable hardware and software platforms and physical and geographical locations (a *version control means that manages version control information for the*

accumulation that assigns a version to a prepared transaction document) (Col. 6, lines 15-19).

Johnson also teaches that outbound information or record data units may consist of processed data files, such as EDI data streams produced by business applications 5 (*an EDI means that creates and sends EDI data for an electronic transaction*) (Col. 13, lines 41-43). It may also consist of information produced at a specific user workstation 7 (e.g., text files, images faxed, etc.), which is considered by the organization or user to be important to the business of the enterprise and therefore, important to be tracked (Col. 13, lines 43-47).

Johnson also teaches an information filtering process (*a linkage means that links the document management means and the EDI means*), which occurs prior to verification/certification. During information filtering, incomplete or redundant units are identified and such units, for example, may be acknowledged or forwarded for special handling or the like. Information filtering may serve to route input record data units to designated destinations. Preferably, data units passed on for verification/certification are tagged to enable tracking of units through the system, for example, for subsequent auditing (Col. 5, lines 9-18).

Johnson fails to explicitly teach a *linkage means that acquires sending information of the EDI data from the EDI means*. However, Johnson does teach that the filter attaches to incoming records a tag (i.e., envelope, pointer or reference entry prior to application processing) which can be associated with a database in order to track the

source, destination, version, storage location(s) and retention data associated with the record (Col. 10, lines 30-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that among the information tagged in an incoming record for later retrieval from a database, as described by Johnson, would have been sending information as, in order

Johnson also teaches that the filter determines which coded information is maintained for validation, processing, retention, retrieval, information collection and dissemination and ultimate disposal for a single or multiple organization units (*registers sending information of the EDI data in the version control information of the relevant transaction document*) (Col. 10, lines 26-30).

Johnson also teaches that the filter attaches to incoming records a tag (i.e., envelope, pointer or reference entry prior to application processing) which can be associated with a database in order to track the source, destination, version, storage location(s) and retention data associated with the record. Where information does not enter the filter, e.g., scanned input, appropriate tag (or tracking) information is added during the verification/certification process. For internally created information, created either at the individual workstation or by business applications, information considered to be important for saving may be sent to the filter for tagging, prior to being released either internally for further handling, or externally to trading partners, etc. Where no further handling other than verification/certification is required, such information may be routed directly to the verification/certification module for operator handling. In either case, incomplete information is trapped and sent to hold area 4 and held for input of the

necessary processing information by the Records Manager or other designated individual (*when the accumulated transaction document and the version are selected and attached to the EDI data, then the EDI data is sent*) (Col. 10, lines 30-49).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 04/04/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, applicant argues with respect to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 5, 9, and 11), that the claimed processing by "linkage means" is a two-way process, which does not read on the Johnson et al. filtering process. The "filtering process" described by Johnson et al. is a one-way process and is completely different from the present invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. There is no indication in Claim 1 (or similarly Claims 5, 9, and 11) that the linkage means is a two-way process. The only distinction of direction in these claims is that EDI data is sent. There is no indication that EDI data is received by the same process.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
06/22/05

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
6/30/2005